DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 257 RC 006 375

AUTHOR Nix, Harold L.; Seerley, Norma R.

TITLE Comparative Views and Actions of Community Leaders and Nonleaders.

PUB DATE 24 Aug 72

NOTE 23p.; Paper prepared for the Third World Congress of Rural Sociology, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 23-24, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Community Coordination; *Community Leaders; *Comparative Analysis; Evaluation; Group Relations; Literature Reviews; *Nonauthoritarian Classes; Orientation; *Rural Areas; Rural Urban Differences; Tables (Data); *Urban Areas

IDENTIFIERS *Georgia

ABSTRACT

The relationships of leaders as coordinative group members and the differential views of leaders and nonleaders in 1 urban county (DeKalb) and 2 rural counties (Laurens, Lumpkin) were studied. Two methods, both utilizing the same interview schedule, were used to obtain the samples. In the first method, the Community Reconnaissance Method, positional and reputational leaders in each county were interviewed--117 in DeKalb, 74 in Laurens, and 83 in Lumpkin. The second survey was conducted in DeKalb and Laurens only, using 368 household heads and 322 registered voters. Selection of respondent leaders was made by (1) choosing top positional leaders from basic institutional areas, (2) getting nominations of general influentials, specialized leaders, sublocality leaders, and underrepresented categories from a panel of positional leaders and members of sponsoring organizations, and (3) asking each respondent selected to name 6 or more of the most influential leaders from his community. Findings indicated that leaders were more likely than nonleaders to belong to coordinative community groups and to reflect a coordinative orientation by naming 1 or more coordinative community needs and that in the urban community, both leaders and nonleaders were more likely to reflect a coordinative orientation than were those in the rural community. This difference appeared to associate with high levels of education and occupational positions held by leaders and nonleaders in the urban community as compared to the rural community. (NQ)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 066257

19

COMPARATIVE VIEWS AND ACTIONS OF COMMUNITY LEADERS AND NONLEADERS*

RECEIVED
SEP 5 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

by

Harold L. Nix
Professor of Sociology
Institute of Community and Area Development
and
Department of Sociology
University of Georgia

and

Norma R. Seerley
Instructor
University of Georgia

RC006375

*This paper was prepared for presentation in the seminar entitled "Community Development in a Sociological Perspective," of the Third World Congress of Rural Sociology, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 23-24, 1972.

COMPARATIVE VIEWS AND ACTIONS OF COMMUNITY LEADERS AND NONLEADERS

ABSTRACT

In this study a comparison is made of selected views or orientations and coordinative group membership between community leaders and nonleaders on one hand and between leaders and nonleaders in an urban community with their respective counterparts in a rural community.

Leaders were more likely than nonleaders to belong to coordinative community groups and to reflect a coordinative orientation by naming one or more coordinative community needs. Both leaders and nonleaders in the urban community were more likely to reflect a coordinative orientation than their respective counterparts in the rural community. This difference appeared to associate with high levels of education and occupational positions held by leaders and nonleaders in the urban community as compared to the rural community.

INTRODUCTION

It is our belief that fundamental to community development or planned action programs as well as their evaluation is an understanding of the leadership structure and decision making processes in a community. It is also believed that productive research in the area of both community development and leadership has been impeded by the lack of adequate conceptual or theoretical models of the community and the consequent improvements in research.

With Hunter's Community Power Structure in 1953 and Dahl's study of New Haven in 1961, two questions came into focus: (1) what is the nature of community leadership structure? and (2) what are the methodological techniques through which the structure of community leadership can be discovered? These questions were briskly debated in the late 1950's and 1960's. Presently, social scientists appear to be in fair agreement on

these two questions. First, there are many shapes of community leadership structures to be found in different communities and within the same communities through time (Walton, 1966). Second, there are several methodological techniques each of which tends to emphasize different structures and different levels and functional types of leaders (Freeman, et al., 1963).

In the early 1970's, other emphases are evolving. Aiken and Mott (1970) have directed attention to the necessity of examining more carefully the dynamics of intervention among the subgroups within communities. Others have pointed to the need for more comparative studies. Another neglected area has been in the content of leadership where such phenomena as action, ideas, values, and orientations of community leaders are studies (Seerley, 1971; Bonjean et al., 1971). This does not mean a return to the old search for universal characteristics of leaders. Nix, McIntyre, and Dudley (1967: 423) suggest that the values and qualities of leaders will vary according to the culture of the group being led, and the situational circumstances under which leadership is exercised. A fourth area neglected has been in comparing qualities of community leaders with nonleaders.

This paper reflects the changing mood in community leadership studies and attempts to investigate some of the little explored areas. As a part of an on-going action research program involving fourteen studies of ten Georgia communities, this analysis is a part of a continuing attempt to test the utility of the community reconnaissance method of sampling for community action research and to explore how community leaders differ from nonleaders and why.

More specifically, in this study a comparison is made of group memberships and orientations between community leaders and nonleaders, as well as, between leaders and nonleaders in an urban community with their respective counterparts in a rural community. These problems are investigated within the frame of reference of a conflict model of community (Bates and Bacon, 1972: 371-379).

FRAME OF REFERENCE

If studies of community leadership are to be productive and adequate for planned action programs, they should be based upon a more precise and consistent conceptual model or theory of community. Hillery (1955), Bates and Bacon (1972), and others have pointed out that there are almost as many conceptual models of the community as there are researchers in the area. Therefore, one of the first concerns here is to describe the model of community which has suggested the hypotheses tested in this study. The concepts of the model are derived from a series of articles by F. L. Bates and by Bates and his students, beginning in 1956 and summarized in an article by Bates and Bacon (1972).

Human communities are social systems of a particular sort and differ from elemental groups and organizations in specific ways. Bates (1960) outlined in role theory terms two basic types of relationships which he labeled reciprocal and conjunctive. It was pointed out that the distinction between reciprocal and conjunctive relations lies in the orientation of the behavior of the actors occupying the positions involved in the relationship. A reciprocal relationship exists when the two positions occupied by two actors in relationship are oriented toward the performance of the "same" basic function. This reciprocal or structurally supportive

relationship is characteristic of special interest groups and organizations. On the other hand, communities are social systems whose parts consist of special interest groups and organizations which are held together by conjunctive social relationships. Conjunctive relations involve two actors occupying positions whose behavior expectations are oriented toward the performance of distinct and differing functions. This orientation toward different functions provides the basis for potential conflict and competition.[1]

The linkage Bates (1962) has suggested between interdependent special interest groups is the extramural role in which actors are projected from their own group or organization to interact with alter actors in interstitial or "in between" groups. These interstitial relationships in interstitial groups are of two basic types. The first type is the exchange interstitial group in which actors relate to exchange goods or services. Typical of this type is the customer-merchant or the professional-client relationship. The second type is the coordinative interstitial group in which actors from two or more different groups or organizations relate to coordinate or manage relationships among their varying groups which have differing and potentially conflicting interests. Examples of these groups are a local chamber of commerce, an informal decision making clique, or an influential civic club. Studies by Nix (1969) and his students support the notion that community power is gained through exchange relationships while the exercise of community power and the reputation for having community power operates primarily through coordinative relationships. Since the exchange and the coordinative relationships are interstitial or between groups or organizations with differing and potentially conflicting interests, both are structurally defined as conjunctive.

In summary, Bates and Bacon (1972) propose that:

> Community is a complex social system with unique structural properties that enable the management of conflict and competition arising out of functional necessity to exchange social products. The structure of this system, in turn, is viewed as a consequence of the division of labor in society.

Based on the above notion that coordinative group participation is generally necessary for one to exercise community leadership, this study focuses on the possible relationships of leaders as coordinative group members and the differential views of leaders and nonleaders in an urban community and two rural communities. Thus, community leaders are seen to occupy a relatively greater number of positions in coordinative interstitial groups than do nonleaders. As occupants of these positions, leaders can be expected to behave in accordance to the role expectations such as negotiating, policy and decision making, bargaining, and coordinating which are typical of coordinative group positions. On the other hand, nonleaders are seen to occupy primarily exchange group positions within the community context, and few coordinative group positions; therefore, the nonleaders can be expected to behave in accordance with the associated role expectations of their positions in exchange groups.

Nix and Singh (1970) note differences between leaders and nonleaders in responses to certain questions about their community. Of particular interest to this study is their notion that "needs of the community" expressed by leader and nonleader respondents can be classified as being "coordinative needs" or "exchange needs" and thus reflect a coordinative or exchange orientation. Coordinative needs refer to the expressed needs for improving relationships or bettering structural arrangements for providing better relationships among groups within the community; while

exchange needs are the needs expressed for more or improved goods, services, or pay for ones labor, taxes, or votes. The findings of Nix and Singh serve as a departure point for this study in which an attempt is made to understand certain differences between leaders and nonleaders within the framework of the exchange and coordinative concepts.

This view of the community, particularly the concepts of exchange and coordinative relationships, led to the posing and testing of the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis I - Leaders are more likely than nonleaders to have coordinative orientations.

Hypothesis II - Leaders are more likely than nonleaders to occupy positions in coordinative groups.

Hypothesis III - Leaders and nonleaders in a complex urban community will be more likely than their respective counterparts in a rural community to have coordinative orientations.

SOURCE OF DATA

This study utilizes parts of the interview data collected in three county studies. These counties include one urban county and two relatively rural counties representing the mountain, piedmont, and coastal plain areas of Georgia (see Table 1 for demographic summary).

DeKalb, the urban county, is one of five counties making up Metropolitan Atlanta. The 1970 census indicates a population of 415,387 which had grown about 62 per cent during the last decade. Compared to state averages, DeKalb is a predominately white, middle class community with very high educational, occupational, and income levels.

Due to incomplete data on any one rural county, data from two rural counties were used for different aspects of the analysis. One of the

rural counties was Laurens County. This coastal plain county had a population of 32,738 in 1970 and had registered a gain of only 1.3 per cent in the 60's. Laurens has a larger proportion nonwhite population than the state and lower educational, occupational, and income levels. Rural Lumpkin County, in the mountain area, had a predominately white population in 1970 of 8,728, an increase of 20.5 per cent since 1960. Like Laurens, its educational, occupational, and income levels are below the state average.

Table 1. Demographic Summary of DeKalb, Laurens, and Lumpkin Counties in Comparison to the State of Georgia, 1970

Item	Georgia	DeKalb	Laurens	Lumpkin
Total population, 1970	4,589,575	415,387	32,738	8,728
Percentage change 60-70	16.4+	61.8+	1.3+	20.5+
Percentage nonwhite	26.1	13.9	33.7	1.9
Median Years Education	10.8	12.4	9.1	8.3
Median Family Income	8,168	12,138	6,346	6,590
Per cent in white collar occupation	43.7	68.0	33.7	28.1

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, Georgia.

METHODS USED

The Leader and Nonleader Samples

This analysis is only part of an attempt to more broadly compare two types of community studies aimed at facilitating community development programs.[2] Both methods utilized the same interview schedule, only the

sampling techniques differed. The first method used has been labeled the "community reconnaissance method" (Sanders, 1960) (Nix, 1970).[3] This method involved interviewing 74-117 positional and reputational leaders in each county. Data were collected by the Community Reconnaissance Method classes from the University of Georgia.[4] The selection of respondent leaders was made by: (1) choosing the top positional leaders from the basic institutional areas, (2) getting nominations of general influentials, specialized leaders, sublocality leaders, and underrepresented categories from a panel of positional leaders and members of the sponsoring organizations, and (3) asking each respondent selected to name six or more of the most influential leaders from his community. Those nominated a significant number of times (usually 3 or more) were added to the list to be interviewed. Using this approach, there were 117, 74, and 83 positional and reputational leaders who were interviewed in DeKalb, Laurens, and Lumpkin Counties respectively.

The second survey using the same instrument was made in urban DeKalb and rural Laurens Counties only. In Laurens, an area probability sample of 368 heads of households was interviewed. In DeKalb, a random sample of 322 registered voters was interviewed. Thus the basic comparisons here were made by using 117, 74, and 83 leader respondents in DeKalb, Laurens, and Lumpkin Counties respectively, in comparison with the random samples of 322 voters and 368 heads of households in DeKalb and Laurens Counties. In addition, a comparison was made between both samples in urban DeKalb with those in rural Laurens.

Measurement of Coordinative and Exchange Orientations

A coordinative orientation is defined as a tendency for one to see the community from a broad, general and somewhat abstract perspective.

The community is seen as a system in which means to desired ends are realized through the process of coordination of its groups and organizations. This coordinative process involves decision making, policy making, negotiation, and bargaining. An exchange orientation is defined as a tendency for one to view the community as an entity from which certain ends (goods and services) are provided (Seerley, 1971).

Coordinative and exchange orientations were operationalized by classifying the response to the question, "In your opinion, what are the five most important things which need to be done to make this county a better place in which to live?" Each response which expressed a need for improving relationships or bettering structural arrangements to provide better relationships was classified as a coordinative need. Such needs were considered to reflect a coordinative orientation. Examples of coordinative needs include "better communication between city and county officials" or "consolidation of city and county governments." On the other hand, expressed needs for goods and services such as more sidewalks, better schools, or more job opportunities were classified as exchange needs and were considered to reflect an exchange orientation.

After viewing the distribution of the number of coordinative needs and exchange needs named by the respondents and noting the tendency for respondents to state coordinative needs in very broad general terms and the exchange needs in more specific terms, the decision was made to classify respondents who named one or more coordinative needs as being coordinative in orientation. Conversely, respondents who named only exchange needs were classified as exchange oriented.

Measurement of Community Coordinative Group Membership

A score was given for each respondent (in DeKalb) for memberships in community coordinative groups. A coordinative group was considered to be

of the community level if within the groups at least three different interest areas were being coordinated. Examples of such groups would be a Community Development Council, a Rotary Club, or the Chamber of Commerce. Further, each community coordinative group was classified as being either a key or a non-key community coordinative group. Key coordinative groups were those community coordinative groups reputed in the community to be influential. Each was given a weighted score of two. Non-key community coordinative groups were all other community coordinative groups with a broad scope of interest represented through its members. Each of the non-key coordinative groups was given a weighted score of one. Points for membership in the key and non-key coordinative groups were summed for each respondent, and the total represented the community coordinative group score. If a respondent had no memberships in a community coordinative group, his score was zero.

For analysis purposes the scores were categorized into three groups: (1) low, for respondents with no coordinative group memberships who had a total score of "0"; (2) medium, a category for respondents who had a score of one; and (3) high, for respondents with a score of two or greater.

FINDINGS

Coordinative and Exchange Orientations of Leaders and Nonleaders

The first finding to be considered is a comparison of the orientations of the combined leader samples in three Georgia communities (DeKalb, Laurens, and Lumpkin) with the combined random samples of heads of households in Laurens and registered voters in DeKalb.

The data in Table 2 indicate that approximately two-thirds (65.9 per cent) of the leader respondents in the three counties reflected a

coordinative orientation by naming one or more coordinative needs; whereas, less than one-third (29.9 per cent) of the nonleaders reflected a coordinative orientation. In other words, over two-thirds of the nonleaders reflected an exchange orientation. This difference between leaders and nonleaders is statistically significant[5] at the .001 level and supports Hypothesis I - leaders are more likely than nonleaders to have coordinative orientations.

Table 2. Orientations of Leaders and Nonleaders in DeKalb, Laurens, and Lumpkin Counties, Georgia

	Type of Orientation					
	Coordinative		Exchange		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leaders	178	65.9	92	34.1	270	100
Nonleaders	186	29.9	437	70.1	623	100

X^2 (Yates Correction) = 100.007, d. f. = 1, $p < .001$

Additional analysis of the DeKalb County data indicated that higher educational and occupational levels appear to increase the likelihood of a coordinative orientation regardless of whether or not the individual is a leader. This appears logical in that college graduates in administrative positions in organizations are often expected to perform coordinative functions and that coordinative expectations in special interest organizations would have some carry over into the community context. Additionally regarding urban DeKalb, it was felt that its size, complexity, rapidity of growth, heterogeneity of its people, diverse specialized interest of

its highly educated citizenry, plus the competing leadership and loyalties of the county's nine municipalities and Metropolitan Atlanta would create a greater need for coordination. Whereas, leaders and citizens in a rural community with its small population, less complex organizational structure, and greater face-to-face interaction would not feel as great a need for coordination. This reasoning led to the positing of Hypothesis III - leaders and nonleaders in an urban community will be more likely than their respective counterparts in a rural community to have coordinative orientations. The data in Table 3 support this belief. In DeKalb County, which has one of the highest educational, occupational, and income levels in the Southeast, 76.3 per cent of the leaders were classified as coordinatively oriented, while 68.9 per cent of the leaders in rural Laurens were so classified. The difference between the urban and rural nonleaders was more pronounced. Fifty-one per cent of the nonleaders in urban DeKalb were classified as coordinatively oriented compared to only 8.7 per cent of the nonleaders in rural Laurens.

Table 3. Orientations of Leaders and Nonleaders in Urban DeKalb County and Rural Laurens County, Georgia

	Urban DeKalb				Rural Laurens			
	Coordinative		Exchange		Coordinative		Exchange	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leaders	87	76.3	27	23.7	51	68.9	23	31.1
Nonleaders	159	51.0	153	49.0	27	8.7	284	91.3

DeKalb County: X^2 (Yates Correction) = 20.970, d.f. = 1, $p < .001$

Laurens County: X^2 (Yates Correction) = 130.558, d.f. = 1, $p < .001$

Leadership and Coordinative Group Membership

Hunter (1953: 6) and others (Olmstead, 1954: 273; Agger and Ostrom, 1956: 141; Abu-Laban, 1961: 75-78; Foskett, 1960: 437; and Presthus, 1964: 6-7) have noted that community leaders need to participate in cliques or associational organizations in order for their influence to be effective throughout the community. These and other indications (Shoemaker and Nix, 1969) led to Hypothesis II - leaders will be more likely than nonleaders to belong to community coordinative groups.

Since incomplete data were available on social participation in the rural counties, the basic evidence will draw from the DeKalb County study.

Table 4. Coordinative Group Membership of Leaders and Nonleaders in Urban DeKalb County, Georgia

	Coordinative Group Membership							
	High		Medium		Low		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Leaders	71	60.7	24	20.5	22	18.8	117	100.0
Nonleaders	3	0.9	43	13.4	276	85.7	322	100.0

$X^2 = 241.249$, d.f. = 2, $p < .001$

Note: See "Methods" section for explanation of high, medium, and low categories

As seen in Table 4, over 60 per cent of the leaders in DeKalb were found to be involved in groups which were reputed to be broadly influential in county-wide affairs and were judged to coordinate a broad range

of interest in the community. This may be compared to less than one per cent of the nonleaders being highly involved in coordinative groups. On the other hand, over 85 per cent of the nonleaders were found to have no memberships at all in community coordinative groups while only approximately 19 per cent of the leaders had no community coordinative group membership.

The difference between the leaders and nonleaders in coordinative group membership was found to be highly significant in DeKalb County. Incomplete data and observations indicate that the same is true in rural Laurens and Lumpkin Counties.

Coordinative Group Membership and Coordinative Orientations

In Table 5, all respondents -- leaders and nonleaders -- were combined and categorized in terms of levels of coordinative group membership and related to type of orientations. Due to limited data, this was done for the DeKalb County samples only.

Table 5. Orientations by Coordinative Groups Membership Levels in DeKalb County

Coordinative Group Memberships	Type of Orientation					
	Coordinative		Exchange		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	23	31.1	51	68.9	74	100.0
Medium	10	14.9	57	85.1	67	100.0
Low	43	15.0	243	85.0	285	100.0

$X^2 = 10.794$, d.f. = 2, $p < .005$

It can be seen that twice as many in the high coordinative group membership category have coordinative orientations as those in the low or non-membership category. If the high and medium categories are combined to include those with one or more community coordinative group memberships and compared to those with low or non-memberships, persons active in community coordinative groups are three times as likely to have coordinative orientations as those who participate in no coordinative group.

Interrelationships of Leadership, Coordinative Group Membership, and Coordinative Orientations

With the relationships established between (1) leadership and coordinative group membership, (2) leadership and coordinative orientations, and (3) coordinative group memberships and coordinative orientations the question arises to how these three variables might be interrelated.

Due to the exploratory nature of the study and the fact that the data are basically of the nominal level it seemed logical to view the interrelatedness of the three variables by setting up the typology as seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Per Cent Coordinatively Oriented by Leadership and Coordinative Group Membership Status

Type	Number	Per cent of Leadership and Group Membership*
Type A - Leaders who are Coordinative Group Members with Coordinative Orientation	27	28%
Type B - Leaders who have No Coordinative Group Memberships with Coordinative Orientation	7	31%
Type C - Nonleaders who are Coordinative Group Members with Coordinative Orientation	6	11%
Type D - Nonleaders who have No Coordinative Group Memberships with Coordinative Orientations	36	13%

*The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of persons who were of each type by the number coordinatively oriented in the leadership sample and with the specified coordinative group membership status.

Based upon the above relationships which have been found to exist, it seems logical that if there is some sort of interaction effect of the three variables, there should be more in type A than the other three types. This is because type A is a combination of the factors which have been found to be related to one another. However, the data indicate that both types B and D which do not include coordinative group membership to be at about the same levels as types A and C. Consequently, it is tentatively concluded that leaders tend to belong to coordinative groups more than do nonleaders, and leaders are more likely than nonleaders to have a coordinative orientation. But, being a leader is the crucial factor in

whether or not one will have a coordinative orientation. This leads to the conclusion that there are other factors such as occupational position or levels and type of education which are conducive to a coordinative orientation and probably have a carry-over effect. This, in part, may explain why many nonleaders did reflect a coordinative orientation. It also appears to account for the fact that nonleaders as well as leaders in urban DeKalb reflected a higher coordinative orientation than their counterparts in rural Laurens County.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In summary, the study supported the beliefs that (1) leaders are more likely than nonleaders to be concerned with coordinative needs and consequently reflect coordinative orientations, (2) leaders are more likely than nonleaders to occupy positions in coordinative groups and (3) both leaders and nonleaders in a urban community are more likely than their respective counterparts in a rural community to have coordinative orientations. It was further shown that being a leader was more crucial to having a coordinative orientation than belonging to a community coordinative group.[6]

There are both theoretical and practical implications for these findings, especially when seen in conjunction with the broader findings in comparing reconnaissance leader samples with random samples in a rural and urban county.

At the theoretical level, it is felt that these studies have demonstrated the productivity of the conflict model of community in generating hypotheses of both theoretical and practical value. It is believed that this model will help to keep researchers focused on what may be described

as community-specific or interstitial norms, relationships and processes between groups and organizations. It is further believed that the model used can give structural specificity to Warren's (1958) notions of vertical and horizonal dimensions of community.

At the practical level, there are some implications for the findings of this study. First, there are implications as to which of the various styles or approach to community improvement to use with different levels of leaders and citizens. The fact that nonleaders showed relatively greater concern for exchange needs (goods and services) and leaders reflected a greater concern for coordinative needs or the means for providing goods and services should indicate that leaders under certain conditions would be more inclined toward what Dunham (1964) has called community development, Rothman (1970) has called locality development, Kaufman (1970) has called community organization, and Sanders (1966) has called the process approach.

Second, there are indications that urban communities, especially communities like DeKalb with high educational and occupational levels, would be more likely than rural communities, such as rural Laurens, to show greater concern for the process approach or approaches designed to coordinate decision making. On the other hand, the rural community might be more attracted to the social planner approach (Rothman, 1970) or the technological approach (Kaufman, 1970) of segmentally providing through its various agencies and organizations the exchange needs or goods, services, and facilities desired. In fact, this is what happened in these two counties. Community social analyses were made in each county with emphasis upon identifying community needs. Although encouragement was

given in both counties to organize to study, set goals, and encourage action, each took very different routes. In rural Laurens, no interest was shown in developing a structure and process for attacking the more concrete technological problems. Instead, the publication which included the weighted rank orders of needs and problems was apparently used by the various agencies and organizations as a guide for program planning. After about three years, word was received at the University that the sponsoring organization felt that many of the top ranked needs had been accomplished and that they would like for the University to send someone to evaluate their accomplishments and to provide a new accessment of needs.

In urban DeKalb, the situation was quite different. The long list of technological or exchange type needs was ignored in order that concentrated attention might be applied to "development of a structure and process for determining community priorities and thus, determining the direction of community development" (Nix and Seerley, 1972).

FOOTNOTES

[1]Durkheim (1949) indicated that the division of labor in society results in an interdependence among the behavior of individuals, groups, and organizations and that as a consequence fosters the possibility of one group exploiting another the exercise of power This point of view, coupled with the importance of conflict in social organization as indicated by Blau (1964), Simmel (1955), Coser (1956), and Dahrendorf (1968), has contributed to the growing interest in conflict model of communities.

[2]For a more complete comparison of the "reconnaissance" or leadership sample study findings with the random voter sample study findings, see Harold L. Nix and Norma R. Seerley, Dynamic DeKalb, Community Social Analysis No. 7, Institute of Community and Area Development and Department of Sociology, University of Georgia, Athens. This volume describes the purposes, methods, findings, and community development implications of the study.

[3]The Community Reconnaissance Method or leadership surveys in all three communities were conducted by members of the Sociology 759 classes at the University of Georgia. This course entitled "Community Reconnaissance Methods" was designed in synthesize the three basic functions of the University -- teaching, research, and service. For a description of this course, see Harold L. Nix and Norma R. Seerley, "Community Reconnaissance Methods: A Synthesis of Functions," Community Development Journal Vol. 2 (Fall, 1971), pp. 62-69. For an example of the series publications growing out of these classes, see Harold L. Nix and Norma R. Seerley, Dynamic DeKalb, Community Social Analysis No. 7, Institute of Community and Area Development and Department of Sociology, University of Georgia, Athens: pp. 168.

[4]For a more complete description of the positional-reputational approach, see Harold L. Nix, "Identification and Involvement of Leaders in the Planning Process," U.S. Public Health Publication No. 1998 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.)

[5]The hypothesis concerned classifying leaders into particular categories, then trying to determine if a significant difference exists. Thus, with the data on a nominal scale level, and a test of differences desired, the Chi-Square (x^2) statistical test was selected. This was done with the realization that the leader sample is not a probability sample and that N would be small for the leader sample. The accepted level of significance was set at .05.

[6]The conclusions reached are done with reservations due to the sampling procedure and size of the leadership sample. In addition, the analysis was conducted with two different types of nonleader random samples -- heads of households and registered voters.

REFERENCES

Abu-Laban, Baha
1961 "Leader Visibility in a Social Community." Pacific Sociological Review 42 (Fall): 73-78.

Agger, Robert E. and Vincent Ostrom
1956 "Political Participation in a Small Community." Pp. 138-148 in Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz (eds.), Political Behavior. Glencoe: Free Press.

Aiken, Michael and Paul E. Mott, eds.
1970 Structure of Power. New York: Random House.

Bates, Frederick L.
1956 "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts." Social Forces 24 (May): 313-321.
1960 "Institutions, Organizations, and Communities: A General Theory of Complex Structures." Pacific Sociological Review 3 (Fall): 59-70.
1962 "Some Observations Concerning the Structural Aspects of Role Conflict." Pacific Sociological Review 5 (Fall): 75-82.

Bates, Frederick L. and Lloyd Bacon
1972 "The Community as a Social System." Social Forces 50 (March): 371-379.

Blau, Peter M.
1964 Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.

Bonjean, Charles M., Terry Clark, and Robert L. Lineberry, eds.
1971 Community Politics: A Behavioral Approach. New York: The Free Press.

Coser, Lewis A.
1956 The Functions of Conflict. New York: Free Press.

Dahl, Robert A.
1961 Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dahrendorf, R.
1958 "Out of Utopia." American Journal of Sociology 64 (September): 115-127.

Dunham, Arthur
1964 "Community Development -- Its Nature and Characteristics." Memorandum. Columbia: University of Missouri.

Durkheim, Emile
1949 The Division of Labor in Society (Translated by George Simpson). Orig. 1893. Glencoe: Free Press.

Foskett, John M.
1960 "Social Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review 20 (August): 431-438.

Freeman, Linton C., et al.
1963 "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches." American Sociological Review 28 (October): 791-798.

Hillery, George A., Jr.
1955 "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." Rural Sociology 20 (June): 111-123.

Hunter, Floyd
1953 Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kaufman, Harold F.
1970 "Community Development: A Dialectic in Practice and Theory." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Washington, D.C.

Nix, Harold L., Jennie McIntyre, and Charles J. Dudley
1967 "Bases of Leadership: The Cultural Ideal and Estimates of Reality." Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 48 (December): 423-432.

Nix, Harold L.
1969 "Concepts of Community and Community Leadership." Sociology and Social Research 53 (July): 500-510.
1970 Identification of Leaders and Their Involvement in the Planning Process. U.S. Public Health Publication No. 1998. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nix, Harold L. and Norma R. Seerley
1972 Dynamic DeKalb, Community Social Analysis Number Seven, Institute of Community and Area Development and Department of Sociology, University of Georgia, Athens.

Olmstead, Donald
1954 "Organizational Leadership and Social Structure in a Small City." American Sociological Review 19 (June): 273-281.

Presthus, Robert
1964 Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rothman, Jack
1970 "Three Models of Community Organization Practice." Pp. 20-36 in Fred M. Cox, et al. (eds.), Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Sanders, Irwin T.
1960 "The Community Social Profile." American Sociological Review 25 (February): 75-77.

Seerley, Norma R.
1971 Differential Views and Actions of Leaders and Nonleaders Based on Exchange and Coordinative Concepts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia.

Shoemaker, Donald J. And Harold L. Nix
1969 "A Study of Reputational Community Leaders Using the Concepts of Exchange and Coordinative." Paper read at the Southern Sociological Society Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana, (April).

Simmel, George
1955 Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations (Translated by Kurt A. Wolff and Reinhard Bendix). New York: Free Press.

Walton, John
1966 "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure." American Journal of Sociology 71 (January): 403-438.

Warren, Roland L.
1956 "Toward a Reformulation of Community Theory." Human Organization 15 (Summer): 8-11.
1971 The Community in America, second edition. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.